REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested. By this amendment, Claims 1 and 17 have been amended to recite the subject matter previously featured in Claims 3 and 19, which have been cancelled herein. No other claims are amended, cancelled, or added. Thus, Claims 1, 4-17, and 20-32 are currently pending in the application.

ONE-MONTH EXTENSION OF TIME PROPER

The Advisory Action indicated the period for reply was three months from the mailing date of the Final Office Action. This is in error.

The Reply After Final, mailed May 4, 2006, was filed less than two months after the mailing date of the Final Office Action, which was March 6, 2006. Accordingly, the time to respond to the Advisory Action mailed June 7, 2006 expires on the later of (a) the mailing date of the Advisory Action or (b) the date set forth in the Final Office Action. Consequently, the period for reply to respond to the Advisory Action is June 7, 2006, and only a one-month extension of time is necessary for the present amendment. If the Office disagrees, please contact the undersigned attorney.

ALL CLAIMS RECITE SUBJECT MATTER PREVIOUSLY IDENTIFIED AS ALLOWABLE

By this amendment, Independent Claims 1 and 17 have been amended to recite the subject matter previously featured in Claims 3 and 19, cancelled herein. Claims 3 and 19 have been previously objected to for being dependent upon a base claim, but would

otherwise be allowable if recited as an independent claim. Consequently, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1 and 17 are patentable over the cited art and are in condition for allowance.

Claims 4-16 and 20-32 are dependent claims, each of which depends (directly or indirectly) from either Claim 1 or Claim 17. Each of Claims 4-16 and 20-32 is therefore allowable for at least the reasons given above with respect to Claims 1 and 17. In addition, each of Claims 4-16 and 20-32 introduces one or more additional limitations that independently render it patentable. Due to the fundamental differences already identified, to expedite the positive resolution of this case, a separate discussion of the limitations of Claims 4-16 and 20-32 is not included at this time. The Applicant reserves the right to further point out the differences between the cited art and the novel features recited in the dependent claims at a later time.

GENERAL ENVIRONMENT AND LIMITED ENVIRONMENT AS CLAIMED ARE NOT SHOWN BY SCHNURER

As previously explained, the cited art, individually or in combination, fails to disclose, teach, or suggest features of each pending claim. Further, the cited art cannot be properly combined would destroying *Schnurer.*

Schnurer is cited to show several features of Claim 1. The portion of *Schnurer* cited to show a limited environment discusses virus trapping device 10 or emulation box 48 residing on virus trapping device 10. The portion of *Schnurer* cited to show a general environment discusses another computer being protected by virus trapping device 10, such as file server 42 or nodes 32. As is made clear in *Schnurer*, the general environment

and the limited environment are implemented on different physical machines. Each physical machine runs a separate operating system. That being the case, it is clear that *Schnurer* does not disclose or suggest, "wherein said limited environment and said general environment are both provided by the same operating system," as recited in Claim 1. Indeed, the Office Action acknowledges, "*Schnurer* does not specifically teach wherein said limited environment and said general environment are both provided by the same operating system."

In view of the deficiencies of *Schnurer*, the Office Action relies upon *Nachenberg* to show this feature by stating:

> Nachenberg teaches an antivirus program that includes a decryption, exploration and evaluation phases/modules causing a CPU emulator with virtual memory to simulate untrusted programs/instructions [Nachenburg, col. 1, lines 16-20; col. 5, lines 27-40; col. 6, lines 52-58; col. 7, line 31 – col. 8, line 47].

The Office Action alleges that "it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teaching of *Schnurer* with the teaching of *Nachenberg* by implementing the limited environment in the same machine as the general environment if the limited environment is limited to protect a specific machine and to have an operating system within the machine providing both environments for the same reason." Applicant respectfully submits that this is in error, as *Schnurer* expressly, and in very clear, colorful, and emphatic language, teaches away from just such a combination.

COMBINATION OF THE REFERENCES WOULD DESTROY *SCHNURER*

The Examiner's suggestion of having a single operating system provide both the general environment and the limited environment in *Schnurer* would destroy *Schnurer*. *Schnurer* states:

> "The inventors recognize that it can be done without a transplatform, but it will be slow and absolutely unsafe. The use of a foreign operating system can be likened to the use of lead walls and glass walls and mechanical arms used by people manipulating radioactive materials in a lab. While it is certainly possible to pick up radioactivity with one's bare hands, it is not highly recommended or is it safe. While the invention can be had without the use of a foreign operating system, it is not highly recommended nor is it safe" (Col. 4, line 63 – Col. 5, line 5).
>
> "The use of a foreign operating system guarantees the invention a high degree of safety and impenetrability. While the inventors recognize that such invention can be built without the use of a foreign operating system, such a version of the invention would lack any credible degree of security. In addition, without the use of a foreign operating system the invention itself risks contamination." (Col. 4, lines 11-17).

Thus, *Schnurer* strongly teaches away from having a single operating system providing anything analogous to both the general environment and the limited environment. *Schnurer* teaches that, while it is possible to do so, not using a foreign operating system is "not highly recommended nor is it safe." One skilled in the art, having read the portion of *Schnurer* quoted above, would have been highly motivated to not have both the limited environment and the general environment provided by the same operating system.

Moreover, *Schnurer* teaches, "without the use of a foreign operating system the invention itself risks contamination" and would be "absolutely unsafe." As a result, any advantage provided by the teachings of *Schnurer* would be lost if a foreign operating system is not used. Consequently, (a) *Schnurer* would be destroyed if the Examiner's

proposed suggestion were to be carried out, and (b) the feature of "wherein programs executing within said limited environment cannot access the one or more real resources in said general environment," recited in independent Claims 1 and 17, could not possibly be shown by *Schnurer*.

As explained above, *Schnurer* and *Nachenberg* cannot be properly combined as suggested by the Examiner to support the rejection based on 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of Claim 1. Consequently, Claim 1 is patentable over the cited art and is in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons given above, the Applicant submits that the pending claims are patentable over the art of record, including the art cited but not applied. Accordingly, allowance of all pending claims is respectfully solicited.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (408) 414-1225 to discuss any issue that may advance prosecution.

The fee for a one-month extension of time accompanies this Reply in the form of a check. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fee that may be due in connection with this Reply to our Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

Dated: July 3, 2006

Christopher J. Brokaw
Reg. No. 45,620

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550
San Jose, California 95110-1089
Telephone No.: (408) 414-1080 ext. 225
Facsimile No.: (408) 414-1076

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: **Mail Stop RCE**, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

On July 3, 2006 By Angelica Maloney